

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,411	01/23/2002	Jong Han Lee	0630-1414P	3426
2292	7590 10/05/2	6	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			DUNG X	
	, JRCH, VA 22040-0	47	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ŕ		2611	:
			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\underline{}$				
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/052,411	LEE, JONG HAN					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dung X Nguyen	2611					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO stute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	3 January 2002.	•					
, - ,	his action is non-final.	•					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ters, prosecution as to the merit	s is				
closed in accordance with the practice unde	•	· ·					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 12</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation	,					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without		•					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 3 and 7 - 10</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) <u>4 - 6 and 11, 122</u> is/are objected to	D .						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and		•					
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 January 2002</u> is/s		objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -,		21(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ian priority under 35 H.S.C.	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)					
a) ⊠ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	igh phonty under 60 6.6.6.	3 1 10(4) (4) 51 (1).					
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	·	•				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No.					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p			:				
application from the International Bur	•						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		t received.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date	/08) 5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1, 7, and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: ""an FDTS/DF equalizer" as recited in linen 1 must be written without abbreviation, at least a the beginning appearance Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the subtracted signal and the reference signal" as recited in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 9, 10 are rejected for the reason above

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strolle et al. (US Patent No. 5,757,855).
 - Strolle discloses an FDTS/DF equalizer using absolute value calculation of a system restoring a data signal passing through a channel comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/052,411

Art Unit: 2611

an equalizer (30, 60 in Figure 1) making a sampled data signal to be a causal signal (30 in Figure 1 and column 1, lines 41-45) and removing an intersymbol interference of the

causal signal (60 in Figure 1 and column 1, lines 52-54); and

a detector (50 in Figure 1 and Figure 4) detecting an original data from the signal without the intersymbol interference by using absolute value calculation (304, 308, 310 in Figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trans PUS patent No. 5,757,855).

Regarding claim 1, Trans teaches an equalizer using absolute value calculation comprising:

- a feed-forward filter (1005 in Figs. 10A-C) receiving and filtering a sampled signal;
- a feed-back filter (1009 in Figs. 10A-C) filtering a restored data;
- a subtractor (see the subtractor between 1005 and 1009 in Figs. 10A-C))obtaining a difference between signals respectively filtered by the feed-forward filter and the feed-back filter; and
- a detector means (1007 in Figs. 10A-C) receiving the subtracted signal and detecting a data.

Page 3

Trans further teaches one may replace a simple slicer 1007 with a sequence such as a viterbi detector as the detector means for a better performance (column 4, lines 61-65). However, Trans does not specify the detector means using absolute value calculation.

Strolle discloses maximum likelihood sequence or a viterbi detector placed within a decision feedback loop, in place of a slicer, to provide an enhancement of the bit error rate in a channel (column 2, lines 49-54). The detector uses absolute value calculation (304, 308, 310 in Figure 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement a viterbi detector using absolute value calculation so as to enhance the bit error rate in a channel.

Regarding claim 2, strolle teaches that the feed-forward filter changes the sampled signal to a causal signal (column 1, lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 3, strolle teaches that the feed-back filter removes an intersymbol interference of the causal signal (column 1, lines 52-54).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 4 6 and 8 10 to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action,
- 9. Claims 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection(s), set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Al-Dhahir et al. (US patent # 6,870,882 B1) discloses a finite-length equalization over multi-input multi-output channels.

Tsujimoto (US patent # 5,398,259) discloses a decision-feedback equalizer for canceling CW interference.

Bergmans et al. (US patent # 5,291,523) discloses a Viterbi receiver with improved timing means.

Aryyavisitakul et al. (US patent # 5,291,523) discloses a time dispersion equalizer receiver with a time-.reversal structure for TDMA portable radio systems.

Watanabe (US patent # 4,271,525) discloses an adaptive diversity receiver for digital communications.

Hirsch et al. (US patent 3,715,670) discloses an adaptive DC restoration in single-sideband data systems.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3010. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 17:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Fan, Chieh M. can be reached on (571) 272-3042. The fax phone numbers for this group is (571) 273-3021.

Application/Control Number: 10/052,411

Art Unit: 2611

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

DXN

September 20, 2006

CHIEH M. FAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER